DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 304 SP 036 987

AUTHOR Chase, Sue; And Others
TITLE Bridging the Gap between Campus and School through Collaboration in a Professional Development School Network in Social Studies and Global Education.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *College School Cooperation; Cooperating Teachers; Faculty Development; Global Education; Higher Education; Methods Courses; *Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; *Professional Recognition; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Secondary Education; Social Studies; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Teacher Collaboration; *Teacher Education Programs; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio State University

ABSTRACT

A recurring theme in the social literature is the perceived gap between what faculty in higher education view as the goals of and preferred methods for teaching social studies and those valued and applied by practicing social studies teachers. In 1990, Ohio State University began planning an intensive school-university collaboration in the form of the Professional Development School (PDS) Network in Social Studies and Global Education. The importance of the following components in the preparation of preservice teachers in social studies and global education have been learned from the PDS project: maintaining congruence, modeling competence, extending time teaching and learning with real students, expecting high standards for preservice teachers' performance as professionals, reflecting on practice using journals, case studies, small group discussion and other techniques, and caring. The PDS has also created new roles and opportunities for professional growth for experienced teachers. The field teachers have become university faculty, extending their own professional lives, and they also have become experts at organizing effective inservice workshops. The program, which has not been without difficulties, has required trust and a shared vision along with the cooperation of the institutions. The program has benefited its preservice teachers, the field faculty, and the partner institutions. (Contains 26 references.) (JLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 404 304

Bridging the Gap Between Campus and School Through Collaboration in a Professional Development School Network in Social Studies and Global Education

by

Sue Chase
Hilliard High School
Hilliard, Ohio

and

Merry Merryfield
The Ohio State University

with

Ed Chism
Hilliard High School
Hilliard, Ohio

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Merryfield

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Presented to the American Educational Research Association
New York City, April 11, 1996

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP036987

Bridging the Gap Between Campus and School
Through Collaboration in a Professional Development School Network in Social Studies and Global Education

> The problem with the methods classes is that they're too much theory. They didn't prepare me for actual teaching in Columbus schools. And my cooperating teacher just laughed when he saw the unit plan I got an 'A' on in methods. He said that's just for the ivory tower, because real social studies teachers don't teach like that.
> -Evaluative comments from a student teacher, March 1989
>
> PDS methods was at times overwhelming, but the seminars and school experiences really prepared me to teach. The different methods and handouts from the field professors and Merry during seminars were very helpful, and I had support when I tried them out during methods and student teaching. I think the best part of PDS is spending two quarters actually learning from teaching real kids.
> -Evaluative comments from a student teacher, March 1994

One of the most persistent themes in the social studies literature is the perceived gap or "ideological chasm" (Leming, 1992) between what college and university professors view as the fundamental goals and preferred methods for social studies instruction and those valued by practicing social studies teachers. Differences in school and university cultures, beliefs, and practice have been explored, documented and discussed over the years as one of the perennial dilemmas of teacher education in general (Brookhart & Loadman, 1990; Lanier & Little, 1986; Zeichner, Tabachnick & Densmore, 1987) and social studies in particular (Kagan, 1993; Leming 1989, 1992; Mehlinger 1981; Shaver, 1977). One outcome of this school/university clash in beliefs is found in many preservice teacher education programs. Some college professors teach perspectives, goals, and instructional methods that are different from or even in conflict with the practice of social studies teachers in area schools. When student teachers are placed with teachers whose beliefs and practices differ from those of their university professors and supervisors, the preservice teachers face a quandary that is exceedingly frustrating as they find their own practice and beliefs in the center of a school/university tug of war over the nature of the social studies. As Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) have posited, there are questions as to whether or not the effects of university teacher education are "washed out" by experiences in schools.

The quandary of dealing with differing beliefs and expectations was experienced by many preservice teachers in the Ohio State University program
in social studies and global education five years ago. Today, however, preservice teachers rarely mention any differences in what they learn in their coursework and the expectations, beliefs, and practice they experience as they work in local schools. Although the program is not without its problems, the school/university chasm has been bridged by intensive collaboration in the form of a Professional Development School (PDS) Network in Social Studies and Global Education.

Our goal in writing this article is to share what we have learned about the process of developing and nurturing extensive school-university collaboration in the preparation of preservice teachers and the professional development of practicing teachers. We have analyzed the PDS experiences, reflections and written work of over a hundred teachers with whom we have worked in the last five years. We are Sue Chase,

a social studies teacher at Hilliard High School, Hilliard, Ohio, and Merry Merryfield, professor of social studies and global education at The Ohio State University. We also include the advice and reflections of Ed Chism, a preservice teacher in our PDS during 1993-1994 who is now in his second year of teaching social studies at Hilliard High School. In this paper we bring together our perspectives as a field professor, university professor, and preservice teacher in an examination of school/university efforts to improve teacher education.

First we outline the major steps in the development of our PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education since its inception in 1991. Second, we present major categories of what we have learned over the last five years about the preparation of preservice teachers, the professional development of experienced teachers, and the process of school/university collaboration. Third, we speak directly to teachers, professors, and preservice teachers about issues and concerns we believe they should be aware of when considering involvement in PDS networks or school/university collaboration in teacher education in social studies and global education.

Methods

Since the initiation of our collaboration in the summer of 1990, we have kept records documenting our PDS activities and decisions. In 1992 we began systematic collection of data four times a year through questionnaires, individual and group interviews, and focus groups held in conjunction with the methods courses, student teaching seminars, and PDS leadership meetings. Data have been collected from all people immediately involved in the PDS Network, including the field professors (the nine master teachers who developed the PDS, teach methods, provide inservice instruction to colleagues and manage the PDS from day to day in their schools), cooperating teachers (30 other classroom teachers who work with preservice program and the professional development component of the PDS), school administrators, the preservice teachers (87 over the first four years), university supervisors, and university faculty. Additional data came from our "archives," materials we have collected such as personal journals and notes from meetings, cases, memos, essays written by the preservice teachers, syllabi for courses, portfolios and assessments, observations, professional presentations, and papers we have written. These data were collected by the field professors, university faculty, and university supervisors and analyzed periodically by the field professors and university faculty.

The Development of our PDS Network

Our PDS network grew from teacher/professor relationships that began during 1988-1990 through several overlapping school/university connections. First, problems with student teachers and one university supervisor (who was fired in March 1989 because of his sexual harassment of student teachers) led to an on-going conversations between Merry and Keith Bossard (Columbus Alternative High School), about problems in the OSU program and possibilities for improvement. Second, several relationships developed through school-

based research projects on teacher decision-making in global education as Jim Norris and Connie White (Linden McKinley High School), Shirley Hoover (Upper Arlington High School), and Steve Shapiro (Reynoldsburg High School) shared perspectives with Merry on teaching and learning one day a week over an entire school year. Third, Bob Rayburn (Eastland Career Center), Barbara Wainer (Independence High School), and Merry got to know each other through coursework in OSU's graduate program in global education, school district inservices, and our local social studies council. Finally, Merry and Sue became friends through a mutual colleague, Jeff Cornett, who had worked with Sue extensively during his doctoral program at Ohio State. We came to know each other through intersections with Merry and OSU and found we had much in common. At that time many of us held leadership roles as department chairs in our buildings, curriculum developers for our districts, and through elected offices in the Ohio Council for the Social Studies and our local social studies council. Some of us had been active in global education since the early Columbus and the World (Alger, 1975; Alger & Harf 1986) curriculum projects of the Mershon Center in the 1970s. Other of us had studied the theory and practice of global education through the work of Lee Anderson (1979), Robert Hanvey (1975), Willard Kniep (1986), and Angene Wilson (1982, 1983).

Our informal discussions often led to the need for school and university reforms if we were to improve the preservice social studies certification program and bring about more effective teaching of social studies and global education in area schools. In a brainstorming session at Merry's home in 1991 we agreed on the problems that needed to be addressed: (1) the gulf between courses on campus and the realities of the schools, (2) the need for reflective teacher education that prepares teachers for cross-cultural teaching and learning with multicultural and global content, and (3) the lack of time and support to change our institutional structures, reward systems, and roles. We recognized that intensive, long-term school/university collaboration was absolutely essential.

We began to meet more formally to plan how to improve preservice teacher education, and by the spring of 1992 we were in the midst of significant restructuring of the OSU certification program, including a total revision of the methods courses and reconceptualization of field experiences. At that time we began to become a team of seven teachers and one professor as we worked together to develop new goals for preservice teacher education that were driven by the knowledge and skills that the we collectively viewed as essential for excellence in beginning teachers. We planned a new field-based methods course that would focus on teacher reflection and exemplary practice in social studies and global education. We spent a considerable amount of time developing 20 seminars on planning and instructional methods such as cooperative learning, group research projects, simulations and role-playing, decision-making strategies, approaches to controversial issues and multiple perspectives. We also addressed skills in cross-cultural interaction and higher level thinking skills (such as detecting unstated assumptions) that we all valued. We decided who would team teach each seminar then chose readings to meet the needs of the seminars and overall goals. We began to design assessment tools such as rubrics for planning and teaching, reflective journals, portfolios,

and teacher-written cases (Shulman & Colbert, 1988).

Since our preservice teachers were required to have field experiences in several school settings before entering the methods classes, we decided that they should be placed in the same schools for methods and student teaching to provide high quality mentoring and continuity in their knowledge of students and school culture. Within each of the network schools a group of social studies teachers began to rethink the roles of teachers as teacher educators. We began to create a new language for ourselves and our program. We wanted our students to think of themselves as teachers instead of college students and trained ourselves to use the term preservice teachers. We decided to use the term "field professor" for teachers who took on the new roles of designing programs and methods courses, team-teaching methods, mentoring the preservice teachers and researching the progress of the program and its participants.

We team-taught our first field-based, 4-credit hour methods course during Autumn Quarter 1992. As we began to team teach the seminars, each field professor chose one or two special areas of interest and expertise that he/she would take responsibility for developing within the methods course. Each year since we have extended and improved the methods courses and concurrent field experiences. In Autumn 1993 we added a new middle school component and new middle school field professors. We also collapsed two separate methods courses into an 8-credit hour methods "block" so that the preservice teachers could spend three hours every day learning and teaching secondary students under the guidance of their field professor as part of PDS methods. We had learned our first year that the preservice teachers' learning increased dramatically when they began actual teaching. As of 1993 the preservice teachers were required to plan and teach at least one full class each week beginning the first week of methods. We continued our two-hour seminars on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons with some content changes based upon feedback from the previous year. In each seminar we have the preservice teachers clarify how they were using their knowledge of their students to make decisions in choosing methods and social studies content.

By this time we had identified immersion in the same school culture during methods and student teaching to be a critical component in closing the gap between theory and practice. When preservice teachers begin to teach during the first week of methods and know that every lesson and unit plan they develop for the methods course will be actually taught to students under the supervision and assessment of the same teachers who are their methods instructors, they tackle significant issues in the relationships between teaching and learning.

In 1993 we also moved our seminars off-campus into the PDS schools and rotated from school to school to make it easier to include other teachers and administrators (such as colleagues from Tim Dove's interdisciplinary team) and actual middle and high students (last year Steve Shapiro's students compared their experiences with conventional and authentic assessment). In 1993 we began to offer all-day workshops for all the practicing social studies teachers in PDS network schools. These professional development days are times for the sharing of interests and expertise across nine schools in six school districts. Field

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

professors and their colleagues involved in interdisciplinary teaming, double-blocking, performance-based and authentic assessment, and reforms of the Coalition of Essential Schools (two of the network high schools are members) have shared their ideas, experiences, and materials with the group. One year the workshop focused on the new Ohio Model Curriculum in Social Studies and its application to state proficiency testing in citizenship. The workshops provide professional development opportunities designed by the field professors. Principals have willingly provided substitutes for the teachers as part of their contribution to our PDS each year. Our professional development component has increasingly included presentations at professional meetings, articles about what we are learning (Levak, Merryfield & Wilson, 1993; Merryfield & White, in press) and the development of our own instructional materials for preservice teachers (Shapiro & Merryfield, 1995).

In 1994 we added an additional 2-credit hour field experience to the 8 hour methods block so that the preservice teachers could spend another 6 clock hours each week with a second field professor in a different kind of school environment (urban/suburban, middle/high school). Since we were learning so much across buildings and districts we wanted our preservice teachers to appreciate both differences and similarities in school cultures.

Lessons Learned About the Preparation of Preservice Teachers

Over the past five years we have learned a number of lessons about the preparation of preservice teachers in social studies and global education. We have found that congruence, the modeling of competence, time, high expectations, reflection, and caring are critical factors in our preparation of preservice teachers.

(1) Developing congruence in seminars, readings, and field experiences A major strength of our PDS is the congruence between what our preservice teachers learn in the methods seminars, read about in articles and books, and what they see practiced day-to-day in their field experiences. Because the nine field professors and one university professor who teach methods are the same people who mentor and supervise the preservice teachers in their field experiences during methods and student teaching, there is no school/university chasm. When Jim Norris and Dave Fisher choose readings and demonstrate alternative approaches to cooperative learning in seminar, their ideas are reflected in the teaching methods that the preservice teachers see in other field professors' practice. Teaming in seminars also supports the preservice teacher's examination of a variety of teaching styles and alternative approaches to a shared vision of excellence. When Barbara Wainer and Keith Bossard share different strategies they use to develop student research skills and manage students' inquiry projects, they explain how their choices are based upon their professional knowledge and experiences and their students' abilities, interests and knowledge. They often get in a friendly debate about sequence or method or ways they assess student achievement. Preservice teachers are encouraged to explore other approaches to building students' research skills and managing projects through their own field professors and others teachers in their schools.

(2) Modeling competence in the practice of social studies and global education Perhaps are most important lesson learned is how important it is that classroom teachers and university professors who teach methods and mentor preservice teachers model the thinking, the teaching, and the learning of outstanding practitioners in social studies and global education. All seminars, classes in the schools, and every assignment need to reinforce the characteristics of exemplary teachers.

Modeling includes demonstration of attitudes, knowledge, skills, and participation in multicultural and global education. Most of our preservice teachers are white males (about 15-20% are female, about 5% African American or Asian American) from small towns in Ohio. Many have had very limited experience with people different from themselves, especially African Americans or people with limited English proficiency. Given these demographics we must pay special attention to modeling behaviors that will help our preservice teachers learn about people different from themselves and work against prejudice and inequities over race, gender, and class. Most of us have extensive cross-cultural experiences and we all share a commitment to diversity and equity. Our experiences, attitudes, and knowledge in multicultural and global education are a foundation for our work with the preservice teachers.

(3) Extending time teaching and learning with real students We have learned that one quarter of field experience in the same school is not enough. A major factor in the success of our PDS is the extensive experiences our preservice teachers have in getting to know their students and working with them from September through the end of March. We expect our preservice teachers to study the cultures of their classrooms and learn about each student as an individual. At the fifth week of methods the preservice teachers make a formal presentation to teachers in their school on what they have learned about their students as part of the introductory section of their portfolios. By the time they begin their full-time student teaching in early January, they have had several months of learning and teaching with their students and know them as individuals. They have had several months of intensive feedback to work on improving their interpersonal and communication skills with their students.

(4) Expecting high standards for preservice teachers' performance as professionals We find that high expectations bring about a high quality of performance. Beginning with a February meeting that sets the stage for the PDS experience the following September, the preservice teachers are expected to act as professionals and put forth as much or more energy, creativity, time, and dedication to their students as their field professors. We focus on the PDS methods block as the beginning of their careers as professionals, not just a college course to be taken for a grade. Although many preservice teachers are initially overwhelmed by the workload and responsibilities of their field professors, most rise to the occasion and greatly improve their interpersonal, organizational, and teaching skills and their content knowledge from one week to the next. Team-teaching, peer review and critique of video-tapes of their own teaching are part of helping the preservice teachers identify their most pressing needs and work on them during methods.

Unlike the years before PDS, most of our preservice teachers get beyond the survival stage of teaching and are able to use student teaching to expand upon their initial repertoire of teaching skills and look more deeply at the complexity of student learning. Based on mentoring experiences with first year teachers, we find an overall maturity and reflectiveness in our PDS graduates that we rarely see in even experienced teachers. They think about the process of what it means to be a teacher. For example, we have seen our preservice teachers change their lessons "midstream" because they sensed the lessons were not going as planned. The preservice teachers consistently plan alternative approaches and monitor student progress throughout each lesson. They have a flexibility usually associated with much more experienced teachers.

(5) Reflecting on practice Many of our preservice teachers come to us with a vision of social studies teaching as the lecture/discussion method of their own high school experiences or the lecture/recitation methods of their college professors in history, political science, geography, etc. We have found the process of reflection influences their thinking as we structure ways in which they must examine relationships across social studies content, student characteristics, instructional methods, and student achievement. We have also found that we need multiple approaches to reflection to meet the needs of each individual. Over the years we have developed journaling, the construction of cases, seminar and small group discussions, portfolios, rubrics for self-assessment, conferences with field professors, and the writing of synthesizing essays that bring together what is being learned in seminars, lived experiences in the schools, and readings.

(6) Caring A central factor in our success with preservice teachers is caring--caring a great deal about our own middle and high school students and an shared concern that our program develops outstanding beginning teachers. Because each field professor mentors no more than three preservice teachers, all are given considerable individual attention everyday, and each preservice teacher is supported according to his/her individual needs. When a preservice teacher is not excelling, many people including the field professor, his/her teammates or colleagues, the principal, the university professor, and the university supervisor work with the preservice teacher intensely to effect growth and positive change. At times we have met as a group to develop interventions for a preservice teacher who is having problems. Usually such a concentrated effort helps the preservice teacher overcome his or her problems. The effects of our team approach in bringing about positive change in a preservice teacher's performance are similar to those effects of our interdisciplinary teams in improving the work of our middle and high school students.

We have had preservice teachers choose to drop out of methods and change majors, and we recognize that our screening process for admittance to the program needs improvement as grade point averages, recommendations, and even reports by teachers on early field experiences are not necessarily predictors of success in PDS methods and student teaching. We are considering adding interviews and field experiences as part of a new selection process.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Lessons Learned About the Professional Development of Experienced Teachers

Long-term professional growth and the development of relationships among teachers across schools and districts are important benefits of our PDS collaboration. Because almost all of our schools have undergone or are currently undergoing systemic or discipline-based school reforms and restructuring, our work together has allowed us to learn first-hand about many different approaches to improving schools and social studies. Two of our schools are members of the Coalition of Essential Schools, and one school has gone totally to double-blocking (all periods are two hours long and teachers have no more that 60 students a trimester). Four of our nine schools have social studies teachers teaming with teachers in language arts, science, math or art (such courses are called "Humanities," "American Studies," "World Connections," etc. Linden McKinley High School is an English as a Second Language magnet school for Columbus, Eastland Career Center is the educational technology center for our county, and Columbus Alternative High School is an alternative school where all tenth, eleventh and twelfth graders work one day a week off campus in service learning projects. All of our schools are in the process of developing new or revised social studies courses because of the new Ohio Model Curriculum in Social Studies and state-wide proficiency testing in citizenship education at the ninth and twelfth grades. One finding that comes from data collected each year is that all of us and our departments and schools have benefited from our sharing of ideas, materials, and experiences and our construction of courses, seminars, and assessments. We have found that the diversity of our teachers and schools, the development of new roles and opportunities, and changing of the status quo contribute to the professional development of experienced teachers.

(1) Making the most of diversity A PDS network that brings together teachers from nine schools in six diverse school districts many times each year provides access to information and opportunities for learning that few of us have ever experienced before. The diversity of our schools, our social studies departments, our students, and our social studies courses has helped us better understand both the importance of context in teaching and the commonalities shared by teachers in very different situations.

When we look back on our early work in setting up PDS requirements for our preservice teachers, the field professors have been struck by both our differences in expectations for our preservice teachers in terms of what they should do on a daily basis and the ease with which we were able to compromise and work out rubrics and common assignments. Our focus on shared goals helped us overcome our differences. We recognize that our diversity--different backgrounds, expertise, school cultures and experiences with educational reforms--is our PDS Network's greatest asset in that we constantly learn from each other.

(2) Creating new roles and opportunities PDS provides numerous opportunities for new roles and professional growth for experienced teachers. We have created and team taught a methods course that has grown from 4 to 10 credit hours. We have become college professors. We are doing much of the supervision, mentoring, and the making of connections between educational theory and classroom practice that once was left to university

supervisors. Now we as field professors are the university teachers in our schools.

Our professional development includes presenting and writing about our PDS work and its effects on our preservice teachers and our own schools. In the last three years, we have made over 10 professional presentations at national meetings of such organizations as the National Council for the Social Studies, the American Educational Research Association, the American Forum for Global Education, and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. We did not know of some of these organizations before PDS, and we have found new knowledge and networks as we have become involved through their meetings. This year we have a grant to write about what we have learned in our work together and five different projects are underway that build on work we have in press or already published (Dove, Norris & Shinew, in press; Levak, Merryfield & Wilson, 1993; Merryfield & White, in press; Shapiro & Merryfield, 1995). Three of us have taken on research and writing to link our Master's work with PDS initiatives. Recently Steve Shapiro spent two months in Poland teaching Polish educators about school/university collaboration. Our systemic exposure to current professional literature and our process of applying new ideas to our preparation of preservice teachers brings about a professional renewal that is profound.

We have also learned how to organize effective inservice workshops for other social studies teachers in our buildings and build a learning community for ourselves as practicing teachers. In our 8-hour workshops for our colleagues we create a larger sense of community across our nine schools and six districts and work on our shared mission in improving instruction in social studies and global education. The inservice workshops are developed by the field professors in consultation with our colleagues. Topics in last inservice workshop included the construction of rubrics for student assessment, a discussion of teacher-written cases of actual problems with preservice teachers, and our sharing and critiquing of new instructional materials in social studies and global education. The inservice workshops play a major role in creating a shared vision for the PDS and in providing a time and place for us to discuss concerns and learn together.

(3) Challenging the status quo PDS collaboration changes the nature of practicing teachers' work and interaction with preservice teachers. It also changes our relationships as field professors with our colleagues in social studies departments and within the school as a whole. In many schools before our PDS Network teachers' work with student teachers was perceived as a break, a time to leave the classroom and be released from the day-today pressures of lesson planning and classroom management. Principals would even allocate student teachers on the basis of "taking turns" so that all teachers could eventually have a break or the football coach could be helped by a student teacher fall quarter.

Our PDS program asks much more of practicing teachers. Rather than time out of our class, our PDS calls for extensive time with preservice teachers and other colleagues. We are the teachers of our preservice teachers and our responsibilities are to interact intensely with them about every aspect of teaching. We want them to question what we are doing. We want them to become reflective about their

practice, and in the process of doing that, we are forced to look more closely at our own practice. This intense work with preservice teachers and extensive scrutiny of our own practice goes against the status quo, and some teachers are not comfortable with such challenges. Through its collaboration and intensity PDS work can exposes our own vulnerability. Those of us who work in interdisciplinary teams have to also convince people from other departments that it is worth the time and effort to be involved in this program. Just as not all college students are cut out to be preservice teachers, not all educators are able to work effectively with preservice teachers.

We have essentially had to "sell" PDS collaboration through its benefits to both preservice and practicing teachers. What we are advocating is a much higher level of professionalism and reflective practice for all. We are also promoting the concept of a "learning community" for teachers. Many teachers are used to working in virtual isolation, and we have to convince them that they will benefit from learning and sharing with others.

Lessons Learned About the Process of School/University Collaboration

School/university collaboration is not easy. Few schools or universities have institutionalized or rewarded such work. When we began our work together all of us had personal and professional commitments that filled our lives. PDS become an additional commitment that required time and energy. Consequently, we have learned to work together in a very efficient manner (as few meetings and paperwork as possible, well-defined responsibilities and time-lines) with an understanding that although PDS is important, our families and our own students come first. Merry's role in coordinating and communicating across the nine sites has served as a glue to hold us together between meetings. A shared vision, a feeling of control and ownership by those who are doing the work, and tangible achievements are major elements in the success of our PDS Network. We are still working on the compensation, rewards, and recognition that must be in place for institutionalization of a professional development school. In our work together we have learned about the importance of building trust, a shared vision, and working towards consensus, the process of "growing own PDS" to meet our specific needs, the problems of working within the larger institutional framework of a college of education, and the critical role of coordinating PDS work.

(1) Building trust and a shared vision The foundation for our work was laid in our early meetings through the development of mutual respect and trust, a growing commitment to creating a better way together, and a shared vision of our long-term goals (see Figure 1 for our goals). Recognizing that each of us brings a different set of experiences and expertise to our work, we value the diversity of ideas within our group. When differences of opinion arise (and they always will), we try to learn from each other and resolve them in ways that are productive for our own professional growth. For example, we have spent considerable time trying to understand why some of us are more comfortable with portfolio assessment than are others, and how

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

these differences in experiences and attitudes about assessment should play out in our work with preservice teachers.

Figure 1 about here

One procedure that we value is working towards consensus. When we disagree, we work out compromises or continue discussions until we achieve consensus. We do not implement changes without everyone's support. Our development of goals for the program was a major step in our understanding that though we come from different schools, we share similar beliefs about effective teaching and learning in the social studies and global education.

(2) "Growing our own," a situated approach We believe in teachers and professors building school/university collaboration from the ground up to meet the needs of their particular contexts. We developed our PDS to meet the needs of OSU's preservice teachers in social studies and global education based on our own experiences, beliefs, and resources. Unlike many PDSs, we did not have a structure imposed by a university or by a school district. We began our collaboration to address some serious problems in the preservice program. Some of us have studied the literature on teacher education reform, the Holmes Group, and other professional development schools. Our strengths, however, come from our assumption that the people who actually do the day-to-day work in a PDS should be the people who develop the goals, courses, and assessments. We believe this "grow your own" approach situated within a specific context is essential as long-term school/university collaboration is very difficult under the best of circumstances. Classroom teachers and university professors who create, experiment and assess their own work feel ownership and responsibility for success. Our approach to school/university collaboration allows for our creativity and personal choices in developing new roles and new procedures.

(3) Working within institutional frameworks However, a PDS that differs considerably from others at the same university may have problems with college support because of its unique character. We have experienced two major problems with our institutional framework. First, because our PDS originated and developed differently from all the other professional development schools associated with Ohio State's College of Education, we did not receive formal recognition as a PDS until February 1995 and did not receive cash stipends for the field professors until the fall of 1995. Soft money grants from a private foundation paid the field professors $15,000 from the fall of 1993 through winter 1996. OSU's College of Education has provided fee waivers to the school districts as part of our exchange of services agreement, but fee waivers have little meaning to field professors who, for the most part, have many hours beyond their master's degrees. Currently our field professors are receiving cash stipends ($10,000 divided among all the field professors who work with our PDS each year). Although this sum is relatively small given the hours in planning meetings, teaching seminars, and working with preservice teachers, it is an important step in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

financial compensation.

The other problem is more complex and difficult to overcome. At times we as teachers have found meetings with some OSU professors and administrators to be frustrating, demeaning, unprofessional, and elitist. As described in Sue's section that follows, almost every time field professors have attended meetings of all OSU PDSs (there are presently 14 school/university collaboratives recognized as "official" OSU PDSs) or meetings about PDS issues with college administrators, we have had negative experiences. The conflicts arise because of conceptual and programmatic differences and are intensified when university professors and administrators say they know what is best for teachers. Our temporary solution is for Merry to take on the role of dealing with the OSU bureaucracy and meetings with other OSU PDSs at our request.

(4) Coordinating the Network Finally, a PDS network with many schools and school districts needs someone to coordinate activities and communication. Merry has served this role with help from field professors who offer their homes and schools for meetings and help out as needed in other tasks. We see the coordinator being responsible for finding times and places for us to meet, taking detailed notes and circulating them in memos after each meeting (so that we all have reminders in writing of decisions, dates, responsibilities), and keeping our "archives" up to date. Our archives serve as a database, currently including every memo and letter written (to teachers, administrators, funders), each year's course documents, readings, and evaluations, notes from all brainstorming and planning sessions, focus groups, and debriefings, and copies of all presentations, papers, and published work.

The coordinator's role is critical as someone has to be responsible for making connections across sites and seeing to details. The coordinator could be a school or university person. New technologies such as FAXes and electronic mail are important in opening lines of communications across preservice teachers, practicing teachers, and university professors.

Learning from PDS Collaboration: Implications for Practicing Teachers, Social Studies Professors, and Preservice Teachers

Although many of our lessons learned and suggestions for effective school/university collaboration are applicable to all social studies professionals, we also see some implications for particular groups of our colleagues. In the "notes" that follow, Sue speaks to practicing teachers, Merry to social studies professors, and Ed Chism, a former preservice teacher in our PDS who currently teaches with Sue at Hilliard High School, addresses preservice teachers on some lessons learned and implications for PDS collaboration.

Sue's Notes to Classroom Teachers

Having been a classroom teacher for over twenty-six years, I have been involved with student teachers for a long time. There is no question in my mind that our PDS Network has vastly improved the preparation of preservice teachers. It has changed the perspective of preservice teachers because we have begun to bridge the gap between theory and practice. It has changed the perspectives of cooperating

teachers because their practice is placed under much greater scrutiny and because they have been asked to take responsibility for the quality of the preservice experience.

Any new endeavor brings its own set of pros and cons, and PDS networks are no exception. Maintaining the high standards that we have set and working cooperatively across several school districts requires much time and effort. Although our PDS work has not consistently been rewarded either professionally or financially, the opportunity to contribute to the profession and grow personally has certainly made it worthwhile for me. In this section I outline my ideas about the factors that have influenced my colleagues and me in our work with the PDS Network and discuss some considerations for teachers thinking of becoming involved with PDS work.

(1) Opening your practice to scrutiny and discussion Classroom teachers should enter PDS relationships because they want to grow as a professionals and believe they have something to contribute to the profession. The opportunities for growth have been considerable as we have become professors of a college methods class and worked closely with the best social studies teachers in our county. We have presented our ideas and practice at state and national conferences and published our work in books and journals. We have opened our instructional decision-making and classroom practice to the intense scrutiny of preservice teachers and colleagues in our building and five other school districts. Are you willing to share your practice with others? Do you want to learn from the practice of others and be part of a learning community that values reflective practice? Do you have the confidence to explain your practice not only to preservice teachers but also in seminars with some of the best teachers in your community?

(2) Making a time commitment In our PDS, I have spent considerable time in getting to know and develop working relationships with eight social studies teachers from six school districts. It takes many full-day sessions and after school meetings for a group of teachers to plan a college methods class and many afternoons are spent in teaching and assessing it. Each teacher has determined our areas of "expertise," chosen readings and assignments for those topics and prepared two-hour seminars for the preservice teachers. Because we work collaboratively, we have spent time with other teachers deciding what would be taught and how it would be taught and assessed.

Planning the overall PDS work and teaching the seminars are only part of the time commitment. Much more time is spent daily with our preservice teachers as we reflect with them about our practice and their practice (they begin to teach during the first week of methods) as we observe and debrief after lessons are presented. We spend time showing them how we plan, grade, develop ideas, manage our classes and share every possible experience that can expose them to the reality of day to day teaching. Are you willing to spend that kind of time in planning and teaching? Are you willing to stay in the classroom when your preservice teacher is teaching and accept a serious mentoring role?

The most significant time commitment may be over the long term. PDS work is not something that can be accomplished in a year and then dropped when the novelty wears off. It takes at least a three year

commitment to build relationships and develop procedures and assessments. We have changed social studies teacher education at The Ohio State University because we have improved and refined our work over several years. PDS means longterm, intense relationships with other teachers and university professors. When we began our intensive planning in 1992, Merry asked us for a three year commitment. Currently we are each considering whether on not we wish to continue as field professors in 1996. We are dealing with the potential of burnout within our group by making decisions as to whether or not some of us want to phase out of the PDS work and bring new teachers or schools on board. Could you make a three or five year commitment to a PDS? It has been our time commitment that has kept the program going--it will not run by itself.

(3) Collaborating across schools, districts and the university An important component of the structural change in our PDS has been our willingness to work across several different school cultures. For me this has been both the most challenging and among the most rewarding parts of our PDS. The social studies departments of the nine schools in six different districts operate differently. We have learned to appreciate each other's contexts and provide some flexibility in our methods course and student teaching in order to provide similar assignments and assessments for our preservice teachers.

For example, one of our assignments calls for the creation and teaching of a unit plan. In traditional school structures a unit plan usually means a one to four week plan of 45-55 minute lessons each day. But some of us are in settings where we teach each class two hours everyday and complete a year's course in one semester. Others of us are part of interdisciplinary teams with flexible scheduling decided by the entire team, not a single teacher. Others are in schools with long (six-eight week) units that culminate in exhibitions or other authentic assessments. Some of us teach in schools where new multi-media and electronic mail technologies are a central part of social studies, and others are in schools with very little access to any new educational technology. These diverse settings require flexibility in assignments and a recognition that variances across school buildings will impact the individual's experience in major ways. Do you want work within a multi-school environment? Can you adjust to a number of different types of structures and different demands? Will you appreciate differences as well as similarities in social studies programs? Can you overcome the tendency to think you or your school has the one "right" way to do something?

In PDS work we not only work across schools but we also work with the university. For many of the field professors, one of the most challenging cultures we have had to adjust to has been the university environment. Although our own PDS work with Merry has been quite rewarding, we have had a number of negative experiences when we have interacted with other professors (associated with other College of Education PDSs) and OSU administrators. We have left several meetings feeling devalued as classroom teachers. Let me illustrate this point.

We are often treated like guests at meetings of all the OSU PDSs, "almost relegated to student status" according to some of my colleagues. We do not want to be treated as guests, visitors or as

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

observers, but as team members with equal status in PDS discussions. Yet OSU administrators have not even put us on the roster. Recognition of our roles could be as simple as our names appearing in a faculty directory, access to faculty parking stickers, or having a place on campus to conduct our PDS business.

One field professor received a letter from the president of the university. He was pleased as he opened it up because he assumed it was to recognize his role as a field professor in the our PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education. Alas, the letter was to thank him for his devoted service as an usher at OSU football games! This paradox (recognition for being an usher, no recognition for being a field professor who made a major contribution to building a superlative preservice teacher education program) illustrates our frustration with the lack of recognition. We have made a very significant commitment in time and energy to the PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education program, and it has benefited us in many ways. Yet the failure of the university to recognize our efforts does diminish our enthusiasm.

A last illustration will show our frustration with the culture of university meetings with other PDS professors and college administrators. Along with another field professor and Merry, I attended an OSU meeting that was to serve as formative evaluative for all OSU PDSs. We were placed in groups of PDSs to share experiences and ideas with others who are working in similar contexts. Our group consisted of all the secondary level PDSs--Secondary English Education, Project Tri (focusing on school restructuring) and the Reynoldsburg PDS (focusing on Coalition of Essential School reforms). This meeting seemed like an excellent opportunity to share and learn from others. However, in our group the English Education professor began by apologizing for her need to attend another meeting and announced she would need to go first and leave. She hurried though her program description and left. Immediately the coordinator of Project Tri also noted she had to go out of town, spoke quickly and left. This left my colleague, Merry and me to "share" our experience with the two people who remained. The message I heard from these busy folks was the same--what you have to say isn't important. Are you prepared to deal with university culture? Can you handle the potential lack of respect from university people?

(4) Rethinking roles and procedures within your school Entering into this new relationship with colleagues across school boundaries and the university also impacts our relationships with the members of our own department and our interdisciplinary teams. We have found different levels of enthusiasm from our fellow teachers. Some are thrilled that we are improving teacher education and are glad to become a part of it. However, some teachers see PDS work as an added responsibility of which they want no part. A few resent us for becoming "field professors," teaching a university course and supervising preservice teachers. They see us as "showboaters." For a PDS program to work effectively, it needs broadly-based support within each school, and each field professor needs the cooperation of colleagues.

The nature of field experiences in our schools has changed. During PDS Methods each field professor takes on responsibility for a maximum of three preservice teachers. The field professor makes decisions on what other teachers in the department or school the preservice teachers will observe or work with. Student

teaching assignments are made by the field professor, not the university or principal. Timing of placements has also changed. In the past, many cooperating teachers opted for student teachers during spring quarter. Now there is no choice as PDS methods takes place autumn quarter and student teaching during winter quarter. One field professor said that a colleague chose not to participate in our PDS because "he only wanted a student teacher during spring quarter." Changes in the structure and roles may cause some resentment among department members. Most field professors who reported an initial lack of support from department members have said that when their colleagues saw the improved quality of the student teachers, they wanted to become involved. One field professor commented, "Our teachers are more into it [working with preservice teachers]... They want to do a better job. They used to think nobody really cared."

In addition to changes in timing, we are asking more of cooperating teachers now. Before they only worked with preservice teachers one quarter. Now they work with one preservice teacher for two consecutive quarters. They are expected to work extensively with their preservice teacher and get involved in portfolio and other alternative assessments. Now preservice teachers are looking more closely at the practice of their cooperating teacher and probing deeply into the "whys" of teacher decision-making. This scrutiny has resulted in what a cooperating teacher said was "a good deal of soul searching and reflection on my part." Are you willing to change your work with preservice teachers? Do you want to work with your colleagues so that they will contribute to PDS collaboration? Can you justify the additional demands that will be placed on your colleagues?

Through all the time and hard work, my PDS experience has been one of the most gratifying experiences of my professional life. I have two very tangible rewards. In the very competitive world of social studies positions, my school has hired two of my PDS student teachers. I see everyone winning with this approach. OSU has a much improved program and enhanced reputation; we and our schools have many professional opportunities as a result of our involvement in PDS. The preservice teachers leave much better prepared for the realities of teaching with a better chance of being hired. We are truly bridging the gap between theory and practice. Social studies teachers can find the time and energy for improving our profession through school/university collaboration. Stop criticizing teacher preparation programs and create a better one!

Merry's Notes to Professors of Social Studies

PDS has profoundly improved our program's preparation of our preservice teachers, and my collaboration and team-teaching with the field professors has been one of the most meaningful learning experiences of my career. However, as I observe colleagues in my department either become involved in PDS work (my own social studies colleagues Steve Miller and Dick Remy are as involved as I am) or reject PDS either for their certification program or for their own work, I have come to believe that PDS is no panacea. Longterm collaboration between teachers and professors requires a special brand of cross-cultural learning and interaction that many college professors are unable or unwilling to embrace. Let me outline some ideas

about the university professor's role I and the field professors see as factors in our work.

(1) Respecting teacher knowledge The university professor enters the PDS relationship recognizing that he/she has much to learn from the teachers. Teachers have the authenticity of current practice in that they are involved everyday in the teaching of students and the lived experience within cultures of school and community. Because of the intensity of their practice, classroom teachers have perspectives, knowledge, skills, experiences, and personal theories that university professors rarely possess. Do you want to work with and learn from outstanding teachers? Do you recognize they have specialized knowledge that you may not possess? Will you value their knowledge as much as your own?

(2) Trusting the group process In setting up school/university collaboration as in a methods course, the professor must trust the judgment of the teachers and share control and ownership of the course in equal status with the teachers. Initially the majority of the decisions will be in the hands of the teachers since a professor cannot ask teachers to help revise a course and then reject their ideas and expect "collaboration" to continue. When "my" methods course became "our" methods course there were a number of decisions made the first year by the teachers that I would not have made if I had been working by myself. Although I have always expressed my ideas and opinions freely, I am one voice among the ten of us, and as we work towards consensus no one person dominates our decision-making. Are you willing to share control and ownership in your course or program? Are you willing to trust the judgment of the teachers and the process of group decision-making?

(3) Finding time and building interpersonal skills As with any long-term collaboration, PDS requires a significant time commitment, and it requires attention to building and nurturing cooperative interpersonal relationships. Setting goals, planning a course or inservice workshop, developing assessments all need much more time when a group of ten is working to consensus than when one professor works alone. Given the contentious relationships between many teachers and professors (as well as differences between teachers from different buildings and districts), individuals need time and shared experiences to build trust and develop ways to work as a team. Our group is a very effective team and our enjoyment of our professional and personal relationships is a factor in our success. Are you willing to take the time that is needed to work collaboratively with teachers? Are you able to develop long-term interpersonal relationships with teachers based on equality and collaboration so that they will want to continue to work with you?

(4) Considering one's university context Professors also need to reflect on their career goals and the contexts in which they work as they consider PDS relationships. Such work may not be valued within department, the college, or university. Ohio State is a member of the Holmes Group and our dean, Nancy Zimpher, has been very supportive of PDS. Yet when I was preparing my dossier for promotion and tenure three years ago, no one could tell me where to put my PDS work. My department committee didn't see PDS work as "counting." Even in the college committee meeting (on how to prepare one's dossier) there was a notable lack of interest in what I saw as one of my major contributions to improving teacher education in our

program. Just as with teachers, college professors are not necessarily rewarded for collaboration. Within our college and department communities, many professors look down upon those of us who "work in the schools" as somehow not doing the work expected of university professors. Will your PDS work be valued by your colleagues and institution? How will the quality of compensation or rewards affect your interest or work in PDS?

Although PDS collaboration does require much time and work, we see our efforts pay off with every preservice teacher. Feedback from other teachers and principals has been 100% positive as the combination of better-prepared preservice teachers and professional development for inservice teachers has become evident. I find my own teaching becoming more grounded in the language, the worldviews, and the personal theories of my field professor colleagues. I believe collaboration is a powerful vehicle for the professional development of university professors.

Ed's Notes to Preservice Teachers

I am a proud professional educator and a product of the Ohio State's Professional Development School Network in Social Studies and Global Education. As I reflect upon my experiences as a preservice teacher in PDS methods and student teaching, I realize that these were no ordinary courses--they were my future as a beginning teacher. Although along with many preservice teachers I began methods with the goals of obtaining the best grades possible, enjoying the content and actually learning something that would be useful in the future, I found opportunities to set myself apart from other applicants for social studies positions. I came to understand what excellence in teaching means day to day. The challenges and demands of working with outstanding teachers and professors helped me maximize my efforts to excel in preservice teaching and to be hired as a secondary social studies teacher.

What do my PDS experiences mean to you as social studies majors? How can school/university collaboration make a difference in your education and job opportunities? What should you consider in deciding whether to apply to a certification program based on a PDS network or one that does not involve intense school/university collaboration? Let me try to answer these questions.

1. Reality-based transition from college student to teacher Probably the most important advantage of learning to teach within a PDS Network is that every day you are processing ideas on how to teach within the realities of the classroom. You hear about a method of teaching in seminar, read illustrations of it in a case or lesson plan, and then you see how it works with students in your school. You eventually develop your own lesson and try the method out with your field professor's students. So many times I have taken classes where I "learned" from a book or class notes without the added benefit of real-life experiences or application. In PDS methods not only did I have the opportunity to study teaching methods, but I got to practice what I was learning at the same time. We learned from theory and practice. We also learned the routines of teaching, the paperwork, the expectations of principals and other teachers, the culture of the school and the students. We learned all of this the quarter before we student taught.

The intensity of methods seminars and extensive work in the schools combined with high expectations of field professors can lead to real-life stress, not unlike the stress that most teachers deal with everyday. Preservice teachers who want treat methods as any other class may not want to deal with the pressures of actual teaching. Do you want to learn how to teach through a school-based as opposed to university-based experience? Will you be willing to become a teacher while you are taking methods?

2. Resources, methods and materials Because we preservice teachers were bombarded with a plethora of teaching strategies and techniques during PDS methods, it was easy for me to pick and choose those that fit my personality. We examined instructional materials and assessments used by social studies teachers in nine middle and high schools. We had seminars in all these schools and had the opportunity to see how teachers organized and managed their classrooms. In different schools we learned about different resources from the high tech to the low tech. We discussed alternative approaches to assigning research projects, organizing group work and cooperative learning, leading discussions and Socratic seminars.

Mentors are resources also. Whenever I had a problem or experienced difficulty in a particular area, I called upon my field professor, my supervisor or college professor, or other teachers in my school who were working with the program. All were available to give advice or support. These people were truly valuable resources in helping me develop as a professional educator. Do you want to learn about many methods from a number of teachers across several districts? Can you become organized enough to deal with information overload and a multitude of choices? Can you meet the expectations of an outstanding classroom teacher who is supporting your efforts?

3. Thinking about teaching and learning Throughout my PDS experience I was challenged to evaluate my teaching philosophies and my decisions. Seminar discussions as well as classroom experiences allowed me the opportunity to rethink, re-evaluate, and even create new teaching philosophies. I remember thinking early on that students were responsible for motivating themselves (ha! ha!). Several weeks later I had thought about my classes enough to see that I needed to change my philosophy on student motivation. Because of the assignments I was constantly reprocessing my assumptions about teaching and learning.

One of the requirements during preservice teaching was to write reflective essays about what we were learning related to the goals of our course (see Figure 1). For some, writing reflections might have been easy, but for me it was difficult, especially when my reflections were returned from my professor with more questions to answer. By the middle of the quarter, believe it or not, I found myself writing too much. For the first time in my life I was seeing through a different pair of eyes. I was now looking at the world though the eyes of a teacher rather than through the eyes of a college student. Clearly the reflective writing helped me through the transition from student to teacher and helped me recognize my progress.

4. **Professionalism** The PDS experience played a major role in my development as a professional. Not only was I beginning to think like a teacher, but I was learning to act professionally in the school and community. I learned about portfolios and began to create one to portray my strengths as an educator. The

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

process of building a portfolio and presenting it to other teachers in my school was a very rewarding experience. The portfolio and my reflection in presenting it in a professional manner impressed my principal. He knew I was serious about my work as my portfolio demonstrated.

Professionalism means forming relationships with other teachers and people in the community. I had the opportunity to form valuable relationships with the PDS faculty and other teachers and administrators in my school. They are all wonderful people, and they went out of their way to help me throughout the experience. I also went out into the community to learn about the "big picture." I attended our Board of Education meetings to learn about how a school system operates and what issues were receiving attention. I also listened to the opinions, concerns, and perspectives of parents, tutors and volunteers, secretaries and coaches in order to better understand my role as a teacher and the educational issues of the community. I subscribed to the local newspaper so that I might gain other insights. Reading the community newspaper is also a great way to learn to recognize and greet some of the students not in my classes.

As part of becoming a professional I volunteered for activities around the school. I became a tutor, a prom chaperon, a graduation chaperon, and I monitored tests. After volunteer work with the wrestling team, I eventually took a paid position as assistant coach. After all, isn't teaching coaching? Throughout all these experiences I dressed as the professional teachers in our PDS dress--nice shirt, tie, dress pants, polished shoes. As I look young, I chose to carry a briefcase, not a backpack, to reinforce my appearance as a professional. I learned about the Ohio Council for the Social Studies and other organizations where I could interact with teachers and learn more about my field. I joined educational forums on CompuServe and participated in discussions about educational issues. Do you want to become a professional? Will you explore your new school and community, volunteer or find ways to contribute to the success of your school?

Looking back, I can not imagine walking into Hilliard High School for the first time as a student teacher, an experience all the social studies majors faced before PDS methods. Perhaps others survived the reality shock of taking methods on campus and then suddenly being expected to teach in a school where you know no one. But just look at how prepared I was. Before student teaching in January, I spent September through December getting to know the students as learners and building rapport with my colleagues. I knew all the students by name. Although I was nervous my first day of student teaching, I was confident in my skills and knowledge. I knew my field professors and colleagues were supporting me. Because I had known since September what I would be teaching, much of my planning had been completed during methods. That first day of student teaching the principal held a meeting for all preservice teachers who would be student teaching that quarter. For most it was their first day in the school; for me it was my mid-point in a two-quarter experience.

Conclusion

In Dona Kagan's (1993) study of how high school social studies teachers and university methods

professors perceive the gap between what is taught in methods courses and actual classroom teaching, she concludes that what is missing in teacher education is attention to teacher-student interactions. She quotes Jim, the high school social studies teacher, as she speaks about the importance of a teacher's personality, interpersonal skills, and commitment:

> Above all, it has to do with the sense that the teacher is there for the students... the rapport between a teacher and his or her students. It's an aspect of teaching virtually ignored by university course work. The university never teaches candidates about being sensitive and relating to pupils... The best thing a university could do is expose them to secondary classrooms, not just as observers but as performers (Kagan, 1993, p. 113)

The field professors not only provide real-life modeling of building rapport and developing interpersonal skills during field experiences, they also teach the preservice teachers during seminars and assessment sessions why such connections are important. The daily work of preservice teachers in getting to know their students, building relationships and finding ways to motive them are all present in the rubrics we have developed for assessment. Although the constraints on longterm school/university collaboration are formidable, the rewards for preservice teachers, practicing teachers and university professors can be profound.

A PDS Network also affects the development of inservice teachers. Often teachers are resistant to "teacher education" that is perceived as coming from outside the school, from experts who are not "in the trenches." Ken and Barbara Tye (1992) have written of the difficulties of working with inservice teachers in global education when the teachers perceive teacher education as something that comes from the university, not the schools. When teachers in the school come to play dual roles--practicing teachers and teacher educators, there are new opportunities for all.

In closing we note that our work together is not without problems. We still face the issues of long-term rewards for teachers and professors, the omnipresent problem of time, and the institutionalization of an idea that does not fit the conventional roles of either classroom teachers or university professors (see also Darling-Hammond, 1994; Stoddart, 1995). However, given all the constraints and concerns, those of us who have created a PDS Network in Social Studies and Global Education cannot imagine ever again working with preservice teachers in isolation from a learning community.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 1

Major Goals for PDS Methods

At the end of the course, the preservice teachers will have demonstrated progress in these major areas:

(A) Knowledge and skills in the basics of instructional planning

1. plan for a specific course of study (e.g., Global History, World Cultures), through developing a plan for specific time periods including long-term (a term or semester) and short-term (a mini-unit or daily lesson plan).
2. infuse global and multicultural perspectives into instruction.
3. deal effectively with controversial issues in the curriculum and as they emerge in the classroom.
4. find and use instructional materials and resources in the school, community, nation, and world.
5. use the K-12 scope and sequence of social studies knowledge, skills, and attitudes/values.

(B) The use of a variety of instructional methods that encourage active learning, meet the different learning styles of students and are congruent with content and educational goals.

The preservice teacher has demonstrated the ability to use a variety of teaching strategies in each of these areas:

6. have students actively find information (from readings, A-V, statistics, library research, electronic data bases such as CompuServe, interviews in the school or community, etc.)
7. have students process information (categorize, chart, clarify, draw conclusions from, analyze, synthesize, evaluate, etc.)
8. have students use information (to solve problems, make decisions, analyze values, teach others, relate/apply information to new situations, etc.)
9. have students examine global and multiple perspectives (more than one point of view on an event, person, issue, action, etc.)
10 lead a discussion to get students to think about and articulate what they are learning (from readings, guest speakers, videos, news, etc.)
11. have students evaluate the merit and worth of information (its source/timeframe/geographic reference, point of view of author, possible bias, unstated assumptions, etc.)

The preservice teacher has demonstrated the ability to:

12. select teaching strategies to fit both social studies content and student needs.
13. use a variety of assessment strategies to meet student and content needs.
14. be flexible in modifying lesson plans so that the structure and pacing of the lesson and transition from one activity to another meet the needs of the students.
15. keep students actively involved in learning throughout each lesson.

(C) Awareness and support of their students as individuals and as learners.

The preservice teacher has demonstrated the ability to:

16. build rapport with and respect from every student.
17. learn about each student's knowledge base, backgrounds, abilities, and interests.
18. make a concerted effort to see that every student learns.

(D) Questioning techniques that build higher level thinking skills

The preservice teacher has demonstrated the ability to:

19. ask questions that require students to go beyond recall of knowledge and comprehension to the application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of content, and include motivating (questions that create interest and connections) and divergent questions (open-ended questions that foster creative thinking).
20. lead a discussion effectively.
21. be aware of problems of bias (gender, race, physical appearance or seating, disability) in managing class discussions.

(E) Progress in reflecting on and improving their own teaching and learning as a professional educator.

The preservice teacher has demonstrate the ability to:

22. reflect upon and continually improve his/her teaching and learning.
23. articulate his/her own teaching style, including choices in such decisions as management and organization, discipline, expectations, extracurricular activities, and different roles with students, parents, colleagues, administrators.
24. develop as a professional teacher (for example, demonstrating integrity and ethics, taking all responsibilities seriously, demonstrating a positive attitude towards students and teaching, demonstrating continued learning, being involved in the community and professional organizations).

References

Alger, C. F., & Harf, J. E. (1986). Global education: Why? For whom? About what? In R. E. Freeman, (Ed.), Promising practices in global education: A handbook with case studies (pp. 1-13). NY: National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies.

Alger, C. F. (1975). Columbus and the world. Columbus, OH: Mershon Center, The Ohio State University.

Anderson, L. (1979). Schooling for citizenship in a global age: An exploration of the meaning and significance of global education. Bloomington, IN: The Social Studies Development Center.

Becker, J. M. (Ed.). (1979). Schooling for a global age. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Brookhart, S. M. & Loadman, W. E. (1990). School-university collaboration across cultures. Teaching Education 4(2), 53-68.

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.). (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dove, T., Norris, J. & Shinew, D. (in press). Teachers' perspectives on school/university collaboration in global education. In M. M. Merryfield, E. Jarchow, & S. Pickert (Eds.), Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hanvey, R. G. (1975). An attainable global perspective. New York: Center for War/Peace Studies.

Kagan, D. M. (1993). Laura and Jim and what they taught me about the gap between educational theory and practice. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Kniep, W. M. (1986). Defining a global education by its content. Social Education 50(6), 437-466.

Lanier, J. E. & Little, J. W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock, (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

Leming, J.S. (1989). The two cultures of social studies education. Social Education 53, 404-408.

Leming, J. S. (1992). Ideological perspectives within the social studies profession: An empirical examination of the "two cultures" theses. Theory and Research in Social Education 20(3), 293-312.

Levak, B. A., Merryfield, M. M., & Wilson, R. C. (1993). Global connections. Educational Leadership 51(1), 73-75.

Mehlinger, H. D. (1981). Social studies: Some gulfs and priorities. In H.D. Mehlinger & O.L. Davis (Eds.), The Social Studies (pp. 244-270). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merryfield, M. M. (1993). Reflective practice in teacher education in global perspectives: Strategies for teacher educators. Theory Into Practice 32(1), 27-32.

Merryfield, M. M., and White, C. (in press). Issues-centered global education. In Ronald Evans & David Warren Saxe, (Eds.) Handbook on teaching social issues. Washington D.C.: National Council for the

Social Studies.

Shapiro, S. & Merryfield, M. M. (1995). A case study of unit planning in the context of school reform. In M. M. Merryfield & Richard C. Remy, (Eds.), Teaching about international conflict and peace (pp. 41-123). Albany, NY: The State University of New York Press.

Shaver, J. P. (1977). A critical view of the social studies profession. Social Education 41, 300-307.

Shulman, J. H. & Colbert, J.A. (Eds). (1988). The intern teacher casebook. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Stoddart, T. (1995). The professional development school: Building bridges between cultures. In H. G. Petrie (Ed.), Professionalization, partnership, and power: Building professional development schools (pp.41-76). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Tye, B. B., & Tye, K. A. (1992). Global education. A study of school change. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wilson, A. (1982). Cross-cultural experiential learning for teachers. Theory Into Practice 21(3), 184-192.

Wilson, A. (1983). A case study of two teachers with cross-cultural experience: They know more. Educational Research Quarterly 8(1), 78-85.

Zeichner, K. M. & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education 32(3), 7-11.

Zeichner, K. M., Tabachnick, B. R., & Densmore, K. (1987). Individual, institutional, and cultural influences on the development of teachers' craft knowledge. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), Exploring teachers' thinking (pp. 21-59). London: Cassell.